

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
COLUMBIA DIVISION

|                                       |   |                                 |
|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Matthew Taylor                        | ) | Case No. 3:24-cv-03869-JDA      |
|                                       | ) |                                 |
| Plaintiff,                            | ) |                                 |
|                                       | ) |                                 |
| v.                                    | ) | <b><u>OPINION AND ORDER</u></b> |
|                                       | ) |                                 |
| Dr. Jennifer Alleyne; Barbara Kelly;  | ) |                                 |
| Davis Rowell; Mental Health           | ) |                                 |
| Commission; Elliot Levi; Carl Edison  | ) |                                 |
| Jones; L. Gregory Pearce, Jr.; Bob    | ) |                                 |
| Hicct; Bobby H. Mara, Jr.; Crystal A. | ) |                                 |
| Maxwell; Robert L. Bank; Dr. Mical    | ) |                                 |
| Cross,                                | ) |                                 |
|                                       | ) |                                 |
| Defendants.                           | ) |                                 |

---

This matter is before the Court on a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) of the Magistrate Judge. [Doc. 12.] In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), D.S.C., this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges for pre-trial proceedings.

The Clerk docketed Plaintiff’s pro se Complaint on July 8, 2024. [Doc. 1.] On July 30, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued an Order directing Plaintiff to file the documents necessary to bring the case into proper form for the issuance and service of process. [Doc. 6.] Plaintiff was informed that failure to comply with the Order within the time permitted would subject his case to dismissal for failure to prosecute and for failure to comply with an Order of the court under Rule 41 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. [Id. at 1.] Also on July 30, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued an Order explaining several specific deficiencies with Plaintiff’s claims and granting him leave to amend his Complaint. [Doc. 7.] Plaintiff was informed that failure to file an amended complaint or cure the

deficiencies identified in the Order would subject his claims to summary dismissal. [*Id.* at 5–6.] Plaintiff did not file an amended complaint or provide documents required for service of process within the time prescribed, and on August 29, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the case be summarily dismissed for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with the July 30, 2024, Orders. [Doc. 12.] The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. [*Id.* at 5.] Plaintiff has filed no objections and the time to do so has lapsed.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. See *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270–71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation” (internal quotation marks omitted)).

The Court has reviewed the record in this case, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge for clear error. Having done so, the Court accepts the Report

and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge and incorporates it by reference. Accordingly, this action is summarily DISMISSED without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Jacquelyn D. Austin  
United States District Judge

September 27, 2024  
Columbia, South Carolina

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this order pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.